

### **AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

The attached "Replacement Sheet" of drawings includes changes to Figures 1, 1a and 2. The attached "Replacement Sheet," which includes Figures 1, 1a and Figure 2, replaces the original sheet including Figures 1, 1a and 2.

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-10 are now pending in the application, with Claim 11 being cancelled herein. Of these pending claims, Claims 1-10 stand rejected, and Claims 5-10 stand objected to. Minor amendments have been made to the specification and claims to simply overcome the objections to the specification and rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §112. The amendments to the claims contained herein are of equivalent scope as originally filed and, thus, are not a narrowing amendment. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### **DRAWINGS**

The drawings stand objected to for certain informalities. Applicant has attached revised drawings for the Examiner's approval. In the "Replacement Sheet", Figures 1, 1a and 2 have been designated Prior Art.

### **ABSTRACT**

The Abstract stands objected to for certain informalities. Applicant has amended the Abstract according to the Examiner's suggestions. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

### **CLAIM OBJECTIONS**

Claims 5-10 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend on another multiple dependent claim. Applicant has amended Claims 5, 6, 7, 9 and 10 to overcome the objection.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant notes that materials in the preamble are non-limiting and, as such, the rejection is improper. In an effort to expedite prosecution, Applicant has amended Claim 1.

The Examiner's attention is further directed to dependent Claims 3 and 4. These claims have been amended to overcome the Examiner's rejection.

### **REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 & § 103**

Claims 1-2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Potzas (U.S. Pat. No. 4,620,825).

Claims 3-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Potzas (U.S. Pat. No. 4,620,825) in view of Palm (U.S. Pat. No. 5,183,357). In view of the amendments and arguments herein, these rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Examiner's attention is directed to independent Claim 1 which has been amended to include the limitation that the mandrel head forms a shoulder between the mandrel stem and an outer surface of the mandrel head, said shoulder portion defining

a surface which extends perpendicular to said shank axis. Applicant notes that neither of the Potzas or Palm references disclose this limitation. As such, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejections.

#### CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated:

Sept 13- 2006

By:



Christopher A. Eusebi, Reg. No. 44,672

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

CAE/smb